



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

recognized by Bolis, brought to Antiochus, and executed.

It is perfectly natural, under certain conditions, for one to use a certain language to win the confidence of the enemy, to deceive them, or to ensnare them. We can discuss subjects in the presence of our kinsmen and keep them secret by using a foreign language. A spy must naturally know the language of the enemy, and, the greater his ability in the foreign tongue, the safer he will be, provided he has taken the other necessary precautions. A general may even conceal his identity among his own allies by speaking different languages at various times. We must not be surprised, however, that our authorities do not give us more illustrations. The anecdotes related are simply incidents in matters of greater importance, but it is interesting to note the human touches that the classical authors give to their works.

SOUTH PHILADELPHIA  
HIGH SCHOOL FOR BOYS.

HENRY S. GEHMAN.

#### DR. AVELLANUS'S REJOINDER

Professor Charles Forbes, of Phillips Academy, Andover, has reviewed two of my recent translations with such careful attention to the niceties of language and with such scholarship in his field of preparatory Latin, he has moreover in the introductory paragraphs of his reviews granted such a generous measure of praise for the features of my work which met his approval that I am hardly prepared for the violence of my final condemnation.

Of my Latin version of Ruskin's *King of the Golden River*, Professor Forbes said in *The Classical Journal* 11.28:

"It must be confessed that there is a dash and go to the story, a fluidity of expression, and a virility that command even our recalcitrant approval. The translation sweeps along with a determined rush, as a river should, but with the tokens of its travels in the flotsam of its waters".

Metaphors are mixed, but the praise is generous and acceptable. But Professor Forbes says again (31-32):

"That one should imagine it possible to beget a love for a foreign language by a *tour de force* in the creation of a literature offhand of a character that has no counterpart in that language, is suggestive of little else than an enthusiasm *informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum!* It is the imperative duty of those who believe in the worth of the authors of antiquity to prevent the furtherance of what I cannot but regard as a treacherous blow at the very existence of Latin in our schools."

This is nearly unmeasured condemnation and what is my crime? In 30 pages I used 267 words not found in the whole range of Cicero, Caesar, Nepos or Vergil. A critic not "recalcitrant" would probably think that in translating a modern fairy story I had done well to come so near the ancient tongue, but indeed the appraisal of my work is still better, for my critic admits that 109 of these 267 offenders are in fact classical and that the remainder are Latin—early or late. His adverse judgment nevertheless stands. The censured words are designated "flotsam"—although the word *flotsam* itself is early English and, like several other words in the short quotation first given, is not found in the whole range of the books of the Bible.

This sort of criticism—with others—Professor Forbes develops in his review of my Latin version of *The Adventures of Captain Mago*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9.149-151.

"The Latin version . . . is certainly entertaining, and the reviewer is deeply grateful to the translator for the pleasure which he has afforded him. The story is full of bold adventures, dashing fights, varied scenes, and human feelings".

Notwithstanding all this a list is made of non-Ciceronian words used in *Mago*. The extent of my vocabulary is eloquently discussed and I am described as "a champion of late and decadent Latin" who flouts "the dicta of classical custom" to such an extent that the reviewer, "a classical teacher who is deeply concerned about the integrity of his work", is compelled to ask "to what end, other than a familiarity with the slipshod methods and habits of inferior writers" my flouting leads.

Probably the Bible is as good a standard for classical English as Cicero for classical Latin and I must deplore the use of the word *flout* and other words which are not found in either the Old or the New Testament. Professor Forbes is not concerned, however, about the integrity of the Latin language or he would not wish to exclude from Rex those 109 acknowledged citizens of classical Rome. For him it is only the integrity of "his work". For him Latin literature is forever confined to the vocabulary of four ancient writers—as though for purposes of preparatory school English, *Treasure Island* should be rewritten in the words of Edmund Burke or it should be thought necessary to change Sherlock Holmes into the style and vocabulary of Milton.

So impressed, indeed, was Professor Forbes with the disfiguring effect of my "flotsam", of which he says my *Rex Aurei Rivi* contains on the average ten instances—classical and unclassical but anyhow wrong—to a page, that he devotes a page of *The Classical Journal* (11.30-31) to a story of a Haunted House so told in obsolete English and slang as to be nearly unintelligible. Over a hundred of these strange expressions are used on a single page adequately to illustrate my Latin style.

The burlesque loses its point because so far overdone. Had Professor Forbes limited himself to ten words on a page that could not be found in the Bible, and if, of these ten, four or five were well known classical English words and the other no more remote than "flotsam" and "flout", there would have been no burlesque.

The difference between us, however, can never be reached by these methods of burlesque. Professor Forbes's success as a teacher of preparatory Latin is fully recognized.

All Latin nevertheless is not preparatory Latin. When a boy has entered a College or when a young man has finished College, the question presses as to what the study of this language can do or has done for him.

To my mind a knowledge of the structure of language and the making of an English style are but part of the benefit. Latin was not only the language of the Roman Republic, and of the Roman Empire. It was for centuries the language of diplomacy, science and literature in Europe and an acquaintance with the Latin language brings the student into relation with original sources of history—turns the mind to the rise and fall of the institutions of civilization. Much of this Latin—considered merely as language—was barbarous. Much was excellent, and in it is the history of Europe and of great issues of modern intellectual life. Moreover, the Latin was a vigorous living language. It is quite possible, Professor Foster Watson

says, that, even were there no Latin Classics, the Latin language would still be worth learning in order to read the writings of Erasmus.

Of all this vigorous Latin life little is now left except the traditional position of Latin in the Schools and even there the subject is shrinking so that it no longer claims the dignity of a language, but has become the text of four authors. To those who approve this narrowing I would advise a reading of Erasmus's amusing Ciceronianus. Of this Professor Jebb says:

"It is an appeal to common sense against an absurd affectation which marked the dotage of Italian humanism. Bembo and his disciples would not use a single word which did not occur in Cicero. Their purism, moreover, rejected all modern terms. . . . The gist of what Erasmus says is merely that other ancients besides Cicero wrote good Latin and that a true Ciceronianism would adjust itself to its surroundings. No one, it should be added, had a more intelligent admiration for Cicero than Erasmus himself".

I believe that if Latin is to be saved in our Schools it must be treated as a language. Before a Latin style can be learned, the language must first be learned. This is the daily experience of the race. We all know how languages are successfully taught and those who know the Schools and the Colleges know whether modern methods are successfully teaching any Latin style at all—to say nothing of a Ciceronian style.

How can style be learned without learning the language? Suppose a person had learned English by the study only of a poet and of an orator. What to him would be the meaning of Wordsworth's phrase "shades of the prison-house"? Why, if it chanced that in the authors studied no mention had been made of shadows and of jails, Wordsworth's solemn phrase would provide the only method of referring to a very commonplace shadow.

To understand the poet and the orator the student needs a real acquaintance with the language as well as with their writings. Words have no intrinsic essential value. More than anything else they are known by the company they have kept. They come from afar, not in entire forgetfulness, nor in utter nakedness, but bringing a thousand unremembered associations. Good literary style can never be unmindful of this, and, as Cicero made his style by selection, his writings can be understood only by those who know the language from which the selection was made.

How then shall students learn the language? If that be really the question, there is but one answer. Languages are learned by use—by much reading, much writing, if possible by hearing and speaking. And since modern stories interest modern youth I have tried to provide Latin reading which will invite the attention of the young.

"And if the ancient teachers of children are commended who allured them with wafers, that they might be willing to learn their first rudiments, I think it ought not to be charged as fault upon me, that by a like regard I allure youths, either to the elegance of the Latin tongue or to piety. . . . The rules of grammar are crabbed things to many persons. . . . And it is a matter of great moment early to disseminate a taste of the best things into the tender minds of children; and I cannot tell that anything is learned with better success than what is learned by playing".

That is the statement of Erasmus, and it is the teaching of common sense and experience.

I have tired to make my position clear, but I know how little argument can do. The conclusion in almost every case comes from the original point of view. Professor Forbes's position, like mine, can be burlesqued,

and each burlesque will convince those who believe that way to begin with.

Those who disagree with Professor Forbes and who believe that Latin, if it is really to be learned at all, must be learned as a language, will doubtless say that the preciousness of a few authors divorced from the history of the world since the time of Vergil, and living apart even from the Latin language, of which in fact they are but a fragment, marks the mere dotage of the study now as in the days of Erasmus.

I should like to reply to each of the criticisms which Professor Forbes makes upon my Latin, but they are very numerous, and my remaining space is small. I can deal but with few and choose the cases where his rebuke is most severe.

*Servos . . . pro singulis nostrum dona ferentes. Pro me quidem sculum tulerunt*, etc. Of these and many similar instances of my use of *pro* Professor Forbes exclaims: "What shall we do with our Grammars and our Dictionaries, if these expressions are Latin?"

A critic who speaks so positively cannot afford to be mistaken—nevertheless these expressions are Latin and classical. Compare *Reliqui Suevi domi manent . . . pro se atque illis colunt* (B. G. 4.1). The suggestion that this use of *pro* is a medieval corruption is extraordinary.

Of my expression *oculos in aequore pascere*, Professor Forbes says, "I know of no instance in Latin authors of *pascere* with *in* and the ablative". The expression is found in Cicero (Phil. 11.8): *Ac Dolabella . . . in eius corpore lacerando . . . oculos paverit suos*. The phrase *sub itinere* in my text the critic says should be *ex itinere*. The use of *sub* in this way is nevertheless usual: Compare *Pompeius . . . quo facilius impetum Caesaris tardaret, ne sub ipsa projectione*, etc. (Caesar, B. C. 1.27.3). My phrase *ab undis iactati* is also condemned. How then about Cicero, mediocriter a doctrina instructus (Brutus 66); *Nam quae spiritus in pulmones anima ducitur, ea calescit primum ab eo spiritu* (Cicero De Natura Deorum 2.55). *Prorsus, perquam* and *alioquin* Professor Forbes considers Apuleian. So, too, as has been seen, he considers *pro*, in the sense of *for*, a medieval corruption.

My text is better than the criticisms made upon it.

In conclusion I would like to ask what kind of a knowledge of Latin the Schools should try to impart. Should they give their pupils—so far as they can—a broad acquaintance with the meaning and the spirit of the Latin language, or should the education of beginners be confined to verbal niceties of a language which they are never expected to know? On this subject a footnote in Thomas De Quincy's Letters to a Young Man is interesting:

"It may be doubted whether Dr. Johnson understood any one thing thoroughly except Latin; not that he understood even that with the elaborate and circumstantial care necessary for editing critically a Latin classic. But if he had less than that, he also possessed more, for he possessed that language in a way that no extent of mere critical knowledge could confer. He wrote it genially, not as one translating painfully to it from English, but as one using it for his original organ of thinking".

Do the schools teach this kind of Latin to-day?

ARCADIUS AVELLANUS.

### MR. FORBES'S REPLY

In The Classical Journal 11.25-32 appeared my article Chasing Phantoms in Latin Teaching, in the course of which I had found occasion to criticize the *Rex Aurei Rivi*. In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 9.149-151